



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

## JOURNAL OF MYCOLOGY

*A Periodical Devoted to North American Mycology. Issued Bi-monthly; January, March, May, July, September and November Price, \$2.00 per Year. To Foreign Subscribers \$2.25. Edited and Published by W. A. KELLERMAN, PH. D., COLUMBUS, OHIO.*

---

### NOTES.

In Mycological Notes, No. 18, C. G. Lloyd comments as follows: Dr. Hollos writes by the column when he thinks he sees an opportunity to juggle up a new combination. . . . But he takes the strange stand, for one who uses "priority" as his chief excuse to juggle names, that *Secotium erythrocephalum*, which he claims is the same plant and an earlier name, cannot be used because it was based on young specimens of the plant. There is logic! Any kind of an old vague picture serves him as an excuse to change names, if he can write "Hollos" after the "new combination," but he holds that he must not use Tulasne's earlier name, because Tulasne had young specimens. So he conjures up a *subsequent* name, and devises a new combination, to which. . . .

---

We owe much to Mr. Lloyd who has never failed to wield his pen trenchantly when vagaries and inconsistencies are practiced in the zeal to establish a stable nomenclature. We do not believe that the principle of "priority" can be dethroned, but we do commend the view taken above, namely, that it is absurd to attempt to overthrow a name because "based on young specimens!"

---

Again, Saccardo says: The proper name of one of the *Uredinaceae* is that applied to the teleutosporic stage, the secondary name is that given to one of the earlier stages (*Uredo*, *Epi-tea*, *Caeoma*, *Aecidium*, *Aecidiolum*). Moreover, when the name of an earlier stage of any species is found to have been published before the name of the correlated perfect stage, it is not permissible to transfer the name of the imperfect stage to the perfect one upon the plea of priority, unless the former is found to comprise the perfect stage also, as often happens in *Uredo*, with respect to species of *Uromyces*, *Puccinia*, *Coleosporium*, etc.

---

What is the difference? In one case the specimens were "young" — hence throw away the name! In the second case the specimens were "imperfect forms" (YOUNG?) — but then throw away the name! That kind of "priority" precludes stability in nomenclature.

---